PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From 1	the RNATIONAL SEAF	RCHING AUTHO	DRITY			U 8 JUN ZUUS PCT
То:					PC	
see form PCT/ISA/220				INTERNATION	TEN OPINION IAL SEARCHII PCT Rule 43 <i>bis</i>	NG AUTHORITY
		······································		Date of mailing (day/month/year) see	form PCT/ISA/210 (s	econd sheet)
• • •	cant's or agent's file form PCT/ISA/22			FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below		
International application No. International filing date PCT/IB2005/000426 17.03.2005				day/month/year)	Priority date (day/m 17.03.2004	onth/year)
	national Patent Class R13/66	sification (IPC) or	both national classification	and IPC		
Appli KO7	cant ZE, Leon					-
1.	This opinion co	ntains indication	ons relating to the foll	owing items:		
	☐ Box No. I Basis of the opinion					
	☐ Box No. II	Priority				
	⊠ Box No. III		nent of opinion with reg	ard to novelty, inventiv	e step and industria	al applicability
	☐ Box No. IV	Lack of unity o				· · · · · ·
:	⊠ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis applicability; citations and explanations					tep or industrial
	☐ Box No. VI	Certain docum				
	☐ Box No. VII		s in the international app			
	☐ Box No. VIII	Certain observ	ations on the internation	nal application	•	
2.	FURTHER ACTI	ON .				
	If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.					
	If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.				ration of three	
	For further option	ns, see Form PC	CT/ISA/220.			
3.	For further detail	s, see notes to l	Form PCT/ISA/220.			
		<del></del>				

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016 Authorized Officer

Demoi, S

Telephone No. +31 70 340-4460



	Box	No	I Basis of the opinion		
1.	With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.				
	- 1	lang	s opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following guage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search der Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).		
2.	With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:				
	a. typ	рес	of material:		
		] ;	a sequence listing		
		] 1	able(s) related to the sequence listing		
	b. format of material:				
		] i	n written format		
		] i	n computer readable form		
	c. tim	ne c	of filling/furnishing:		
		] (	contained in the international application as filed.		
		] 1	iled together with the international application in computer readable form.		
		] 1	furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.		
3.	l (	has cop	ddition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional ies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as ropriate, were furnished.		
4.	Addit	tion	al comments:		

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to payalty. Investigation						
Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability						
The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:						
Ø	claims Nos. 38, 39					
be	because:					
	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):					
☒	the description, claims or draw unclear that no meaningful opin	ings nion (	(indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. 38, 39 are so could be formed (specify):			
	see separate sheet					
	the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.					
	no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.					
	the written form		has not been furnished			
			does not comply with the standard			
	the computer readable form		has not been furnished			
			does not comply with the standard			
	the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C- <i>bis</i> of the Administrative Instructions					
	See separate sheet for further of	letail	s			

International application No. PCT/IB2005/000426

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

2-23, 25-34

No: Claims

1,24,35,36,37

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-37

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-37

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

#### Re Item III.

## INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 38 and 39

The terms used in claims 38 and 39 are vague and unclear and leave the reader in doubt as to the meaning of the technical features to which they refer, thereby rendering the definition of the subject-matter of said claims unclear, Article 6 and Rule 6.2(a) PCT.

#### Re Item V.

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: EP 0 495 980 A (MITSUBISHI MINING &; CEMENT CO., LTD) 29 July 1992 (1992-07-29)

D2: US 4 191 985 A (PHILLIPS, CHARLES M JR) 4 March 1980 (1980-03-04)

D3: US 4 729 055 A (DORIVAL ET AL) 1 March 1988 (1988-03-01)

## 2 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT. Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

A network protector comprising:

- node connecting means (A) for connecting the network protector (1) to a node in an electronic network;
- hub connecting means (B) for connecting the network protector (1) to a hub in the electronic network; and
- a non-earthed surge protection circuit (2,3) for allowing electronic communication between the node connecting means (A) and the hub connecting means (B), the surge protection circuit (2,3) including circuit breaking means (3) for disrupting electronic communication between the node connecting means and the hub connecting means upon a surge exceeding a predetermined magnitude being

received by the surge protection circuit.

# 3 INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 24, 35, 36 and 37

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 24, 35, 36 and 37 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

An analogous reasoning as set forward in paragraph 2 can be applied on claims 24, 35, 36 and 37.

## 4 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-23, 25-34

Dependent claims 2-23, 25-34 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT).

## 5 INDUSTRIAL APPLICABILITY

Claims 1-37 relate to subject-matter regarding electrical connections, consequently the industrial applicability of the subject-matter of these claims, as required by Article 33(4) PCT, is fulfilled.

### 6 REMARK

An analogous reasoning as set forward in paragraph 2 can be applied on claims 24, 35, 36 and 37 using document D2 or using document D3.

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

10/592,974

From		DOLUNG ALTER			REC'D 0 8 JUN 2005	
To:			JRITY	·	PCWPO PO	
see form PCT/ISA/220				WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1)		
				Date of malling (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)		
	icant's or agent's file form PCT/ISA/22			FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below		
	national application I I/IB2005/000426		International filing date (	(day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) 17.03.2004		
	national Patent Class R13/66	sification (IPC) or	l both national classification	and IPC	I	
	icant TZE, Leon				•	
1.	_		ons relating to the foll	lowing items:		
	⊠ Box No. I	Basis of the op	pinion			
	Box No. II Priority			ard to novelty. Inventive	a stan and industrial applicability	
	<ul> <li>☑ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with reg</li> <li>☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention</li> </ul>		•	gard to noverty, inventive step and industrial applicability		
	Box No. V  Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement					
	☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited			· · · · · ·		
	☐ Box No. VII	Certain defects	s in the international app	plication		
	☐ Box No. VIII	Certain observ	ations on the internation	nal application		
2.	FURTHER ACT	ION .			•	
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.						
If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.				nts, before the expiration of three		
	For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.					
3.	3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.					

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016 Authorized Officer

Demol, S

Telephone No. +31 70 340-4460



	Box	N	o. I Basis of the opinion		
1.	. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.				
		lar	is opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following nguage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search nder Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).		
2.	. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:				
	a. ty	/pe	of material:		
	[	⊐	a sequence listing		
	[		table(s) related to the sequence listing		
	b. format of material:				
	[	3	in written format		
	[	)	in computer readable form		
	c. ti	me	of filling/furnishing:		
	[		contained in the international application as filed.		
	[		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.		
	(		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.		
3.		ha co	addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto s been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional pies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as propriate, were furnished.		
4.	Add	litio	nal comments:		

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, Inventive step and industrial applicability						
The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:						
Ø	claims Nos. 38, 39					
because:						
	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):					
Ø	the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. 38, 39 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):					
	see separate sheet					
	the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.					
	no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.					
	the written form		has not been furnished			
			does not comply with the standard			
	the computer readable form		has not been furnished			
			does not comply with the standard			
	the tables related to the nucleoti not comply with the technical red	de a quire	and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do ements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.			
	See separate sheet for further details					

International application No. PCT/IB2005/000426

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

2-23, 25-34

No: Claims

1,24,35,36,37

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-37

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-37

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

### Re Item III.

### INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 38 and 39

The terms used in claims 38 and 39 are vague and unclear and leave the reader in doubt as to the meaning of the technical features to which they refer, thereby rendering the definition of the subject-matter of said claims unclear, Article 6 and Rule 6.2(a) PCT.

### Re Item V.

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: EP 0 495 980 A (MITSUBISHI MINING &; CEMENT CO., LTD) 29 July 1992

(1992-07-29)

D2: US 4 191 985 A (PHILLIPS, CHARLES M JR) 4 March 1980 (1980-03-04)

D3: US 4 729 055 A (DORIVAL ET AL) 1 March 1988 (1988-03-01)

# 2 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

A network protector comprising:

- node connecting means (A) for connecting the network protector (1) to a node in an electronic network;
- hub connecting means (B) for connecting the network protector (1) to a hub in the electronic network; and
- a non-earthed surge protection circuit (2,3) for allowing electronic communication between the node connecting means (A) and the hub connecting means (B), the surge protection circuit (2,3) including circuit breaking means (3) for disrupting electronic communication between the node connecting means and the hub connecting means upon a surge exceeding a predetermined magnitude being

received by the surge protection circuit.

# 3 INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 24, 35, 36 and 37

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 24, 35, 36 and 37 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

An analogous reasoning as set forward in paragraph 2 can be applied on claims 24, 35, 36 and 37.

# 4 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-23, 25-34

Dependent claims 2-23, 25-34 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT).

## 5 INDUSTRIAL APPLICABILITY

Claims 1-37 relate to subject-matter regarding electrical connections, consequently the industrial applicability of the subject-matter of these claims, as required by Article 33(4) PCT, is fulfilled.

### 6 REMARK

An analogous reasoning as set forward in paragraph 2 can be applied on claims 24, 35, 36 and 37 using document D2 or using document D3.